

REMARKS

Claims 4-8, and 10-31 are currently pending. Claim 4 is currently amended. Claims 22-31 are new. Claims 1-3 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claim 9, is currently cancelled without prejudice. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9, 13, and 18-21.

Independent claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claim 9, indicated by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 22 is new, and incorporates all recitations of dependent claim 13 into independent form, indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Claims 23-27 depend from independent claim 22.

Independent claim 28 is new, and incorporate all recitations of dependent claim 18, indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Claims 29-31 depend from independent claim 28.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Objections to the Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has indicated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 4, 2004 failed to comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because there were no blank spaces next to each citation for the Examiner's initials when the Examiner considers the cited documents. As a PTO-1449 form in compliance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 is submitted herewith in Appendix A, Applicant submits this objection is moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-8, 10-12, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,309,370 to Haim et al. ("Haim"). These rejections should be withdrawn. As stated above, independent claim 4 has been amended to incorporate all recitations of dependent claim 9, indicated by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter. Thus, the rejection of claim 4 by Haim is overcome. Moreover, as claims 5-8, and 10-21 depend from independent claim 4, these rejections are similarly overcome, for at least this reason.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haim. As discussed above, independent claim 4 is allowable over Haim. Claim 15 depends from claim 4. Thus, the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn, for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed claims 4-8, and 10-31 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner not agree with any of Applicant's positions or arguments herein, a telephonic or personal interview is respectfully requested to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

An additional claims fee in the amount of \$350 is believed to be due for this response. Please charge this fee, and any additional fees that may be due, to Jones Day Account No. 503013.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 7, 2006

s/Brent P. Ray

54,390

Brent P. Ray

(Reg. No.)

For: Gidon D. Stern

(Reg No. 27,469)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939